

Proudly indeed the city of New York welcomes the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks to the city of its birth. We rejoice in Elksdom's achievements. We know that this grand lodge session at the business meetings which will get underway tomorrow will chart a course for future achievements for the betterment of all America.

Our city offers you all its resources for your comfort and for your convenience while you attend to the business that brings you here, and as the most hospitable city in the world, New York bids you, when the time comes to play, to enjoy to the fullest the pleasures of good life that this city offers in abundance. And, in addition to its amusements, we have this year the New York World's Fair which all of you must visit as frequently as possible and see as much of it as you can—even if it necessitates remaining for a few extra days.

We all know the joyousness of life when enriched with good fellowship, and we all want to share it with others.

Thank you very much—and God bless you.

Time for Debate on Vietnam *VN*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1964, the Washington Post carried an article by Prof. Amitai Etzioni of Columbia University which I believe is of interest. As I stated in my speech on this subject on June 10, there is very little debate carried on in or out of Congress on U.S. policy in southeast Asia. I urge my colleagues to read the following article in the hope that it will stimulate public discussion of this most important issue:

NEUTRAL INDOCHINA STILL A BUFFER—ASIA SCHOLAR ARGUES THAT PEIPING ONLY WANTS A QUIET BORDER

(Two weeks ago in this section, Prof. Wesley R. Fishel, of Michigan State University, wrote that the United States could neither withdraw from former Indochina nor allow it to be neutralized. Our only choice, he argued, was to "stay and fight." Here is a differing opinion on what our policy should be, written by an associate professor of sociology and a staff member of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Amitai Etzioni is also the author of "Winning Without War," recently published by Doubleday.)

(By Amitai Etzioni)

In the last few weeks, the United States has again escalated the war in southeast Asia by strafing pro-Communist positions in Laos with rockets which hit, among other targets, a Chinese mission.

Like previous escalations, this one did not bring us an inch closer to winning the war; guerrilla wars are never won from the air. Like previous escalations, it involved us more deeply in a war that continually costs more lives and resources. This involvement, in effect, has given Communist China the option to decide if and when to turn this war into a Korean-type confrontation.

If tomorrow, China were to match our thousands of advisers, our mass supply of modern weapons and our aerial bombardments, we would either have to retreat openly under fire (which is quite inconceivable),

engage in a large-scale conventional war (which the Democrats swore never to get entangled in again after Korea) or use nuclear weapons, which would at least push China back into the arms of the Soviet Union and probably instigate a world war.

A DULLES LEGACY

The alternative is not preventive surrender but genuine neutralization. In examining neutralization, we have not yet freed ourselves from the Dulles tradition that sees in neutrality the immoral position of non-commitment in the struggle between the forces of light and darkness as well as an invitation to the Communists to try to fill the resulting vacuum. That neutralization is supported by De Gaulle (and the U.S.S.R.) is viewed by many in the capital as sufficient evidence in itself that this idea does not warrant careful consideration.

The critical question is not whether the area can be neutralized but whether neutralization can be made to stick and not be a thin cover for an American retreat and a Communist takeover. In principle, neutralization can be made to work only if it is in the interest of all the big powers concerned. It is my central contention that this is the case in southeast Asia now.

The key to our mistrust of a neutralist solution for southeast Asia is our expectation that it will result in Chinese domination of the region. China is depicted by our propaganda as a major aggressive, expansionist power ready to engulf first the Indochinese peninsula, then Malaysia and Indonesia and soon all of Asia.

PEIPING OVERRATED

A busy team of learned State Department staff members and consultants provides an endless flood of quotations from Chinese writings and speeches to this effect. But we should learn to distinguish between pronouncements and policy.

In reality, China is neither a major nor an aggressive power, and neutralization of the area would be in line with its present foreign policy. China's bellicose threats seek to cover up a quite cautious foreign policy in order to gain favor in the international Communist movement without incurring the risk of a major war.

China has talked about liberating Taiwan for half a generation but has done nothing, about it. China has criticized Khrushchev for retreating from Cuba but itself did not try to move into next-door Hong Kong, full of pro-Chinese Communists. It has not launched an attack on Quemoy and Matsu, 3 miles from its mainland shore.

Far from being the aggressive nation we tend to describe, it has improved its relations with Japan, Pakistan, and Ceylon, increased its trade with Britain and Canada and won the recognition of more than 50 countries.

In general, Communist China's policy at this stage seems to be to support weak neutral governments on its borders. Cambodia has been such a weak neutral country for a decade and a half; Burma readily qualifies for the same characterization; Nepal is not exactly a formidable opponent or a Western ally. Yet these countries are as free as Pakistan or Thailand.

Even when India's defenses collapsed, China did not take the risks involved in marching deeper into the country but limited itself to holding a border zone that has been in dispute for years, and over which even Nationalist China recognizes mainland China's claim. Once India was shown to be weak, it was left alone.

None of these neutral countries has been annexed because China itself is weak. Her agriculture is in a mess; her industrialization is floundering; a succession of administrative crises and food shortages have left the country with a low morale; the Chinese army is poorly equipped; China has found it difficult to obtain gasoline to fly its air-

planes since the Soviet Union cut off the supply; it has no nuclear weapons or modern systems of delivery.

For at least the next decade, China will have to focus on building up its industrial base. Whether that goal can be reached in less than 20 years and whether China will be as Stalinist and bellicose after that period as it is now are open questions. For the next 10 years, however, China is to be expected to prefer weak neutral countries on its borders over the risks of a fuller confrontation with the United States as a result of a violation of a neutrality pact.

To be successful, neutralization must be backed by power. We must make clear from the onset that neutralization will win our support only if China and Russia will commit themselves to refrain from armed intervention in the neutralized area, and that any violation of these commitments will bring our return with a vengeance, with whatever force required.

We are now committed to protect the people of the area from external aggression and to assure their right of self-determination; we can fulfill this commitment under neutralization by setting up remote deterrence forces, i.e., by holding forces in a state of readiness outside a given territory to deter the intrusion of the other side and if necessary to counter it.

The zone to be neutralized has yet to be determined. Ideally, all of southeast Asia should be included. North Vietnam was a Chinese vassal for hundreds of years, and its leaders still fear and resent Chinese overlordship. Given an opportunity, Ho Chi Minh might well prefer to act like Yugoslavia, at least like Rumania.

But it might be too late for the inclusion of North Vietnam; the younger generation of pro-Chinese leaders might be too deeply entrenched for this plan. Nor is China likely to let go of North Vietnam.

It would be more realistic to neutralize an area where China would be unwilling to accept the risks involved in continued or renewed conflict with the United States: South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos south and west of the 1962 neutralization line (which the pro-Communist forces have not yet crossed).

Such a zone would obviously meet with the approval of France and have the active support of Russia; the U.S.S.R. seeks to contain Chinese influence in Asia.

A neutral zone established in line with the interests of all concerned might still be eroded and a major war triggered if either side, while seeking to adhere to its commitment, felt that the other side had violated the pact. That is what happened with the 1954 and 1961-62 neutralization accords.

Not only were they not backed by power, but an utterly ineffectual international machinery was set up to supervise their implementation. A fair sized United Nations observer force patrolling the borders of the area would go a long way toward doing that job.

By making violations more visible to world public opinion, they would become less tempting. (No U.N. force could deter a major power intending openly to violate the neutrality pact; that would be the task of the remote deterrence forces.) Such a U.N. force would be much more likely to gain Soviet financial support than the peacekeeping activities in the Congo or Gaza strip.

After a short period of pacification, free elections should be held in the neutralized territories under U.N. supervision. There seems to be no reason why Cambodia would not retain its current Government nor why south Laos, shorn of the Communists in the north, would not continue to be governed by the present Vientiane coalition of rightists and neutralists.

The fate of the South Vietnamese Government is less easy to predict. The present

As if the publishing operations of nonprofit associations were not going to be under enough fire from the IRS, another Federal agency is moving in a direction which could mean higher costs. Most associations currently enjoy low postal rates on their magazines. For example, under present second-class rates a commercial publisher must pay 3.36 cents to 9.48 cents—depending on distance—to mail a 1-pound magazine containing 60-percent advertising and 40-percent text. A nonprofit group pays a lowered uniform 1.7 cents.

But in a recent report to Congress, Postmaster General Gronouski called for a re-examination of the special postage rates granted the nonprofit groups. "Public service costs are mounting rapidly," the report said. "The Congress must decide whether the social benefits of these mailings are worth all the costs they engender."

He said mailings at the nonprofit rate account for 20 percent of all second class volume and cost the Post Office \$87.6 million to handle in fiscal 1963. It collected \$6.4 million in postage, leaving a "public service" deficit of \$81.2 million.

However, the chances of any major rate revision are generally regarded as slim. One congressional aid says that the political power of nonprofit groups makes it tough to raise the postal rates they pay.

every site of land under our flag. I am doubly honored tonight, for it is my privilege and pleasure to extend to this 100th grand lodge session of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks the official greetings of the city of New York on behalf of our distinguished mayor, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner. Other duties that took him out of the city tonight have made it impossible for Brother Wagner to be here and personally bid you welcome to our great and wonderful city.

As a member and as a past exalted ruler of New York Lodge No. 1, the fountainhead lodge of Elksdom, Mayor Wagner is himself a member of this grand lodge and shares with all of our 1,330,000 brothers throughout America the love and affection that we hold for the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

It is always a special occasion when the Elks return to New York for the national convention. New York is the home town to all Elks, wherever we live, for it was here that our order was founded. It was from New York City that the actors and entertainers who conceived the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks introduced it in their travels to distant parts of the land and passed down to other men the high ideal of a brotherhood united by the principles of charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity. It is with rightful and justifiable pride that New York looks upon the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks as one of its finest contributions to the people of America.

Today there are more than 2,200 Elks lodges, and every week the number grows. They are in the great cities and in the small cities and in the villages throughout our land. Wherever they are, the Elks lodge is and has always been, thank God, and always will be a home of stouthearted Americans. The history of our order covers half of the history of our country, and at any time, in peace or in war, the Elks have been determined and aggressive defenders of liberty and unyielding foes of whoever sought to destroy or weaken it.

Ours is a great order. Down through the years and since it came into being in the great city of New York, it has given a splendid service to millions of Americans. I think it can be truly said, with no reflection on any other fraternity, that the Order of Elks, since its inception, has contributed as much, if not more, to the happiness and well-being and to the spiritual and educational facilities of the people of this nation as has any other fraternal order.

We have been very fortunate that the order has ever been wise in the selection of men to direct its destinies. I am not going to attempt to mention names, because the list is so long that I fear I might omit some worthy member; but I can say to you that there are gathered on this stage men who for 20 to 40 years or more have served this order faithfully and well. They have given freely of their time and effort for the order during the years. They have come up through the ranks, and after they had served in their own lodges and in their own cities or villages, when they assumed the position of Grand Exalted Ruler, they gave all that was in them to justify the confidence that was placed in them by the membership of our great order. After they completed their year in office, after they gave up the duties of that office, and were succeeded by other Grand Exalted Rulers, they did not stop there. Year after year these very fine Elks, great Americans all, still remain active and give freely of their time and effort for the good of our order.

To the men who now direct the destinies of this Order, and to this group gathered here tonight, may I say that whatever success has come to the Order of Elks can, in my judgment, be attributed to the leadership that

has been given to it by the grand exalted rulers who are here tonight and those who have passed on.

We preach Americanism and practice Americanism. We do these things not from a blind acceptance of the past, but because we know that we are the inheritors of the political, social and economic ideas and ideals that have answered the prayers in men's hearts and are the source of our strength and our greatness as a Nation. Because of our firm faith in the American dream we have never lost confidence in our way of life. Spaceships may arise into the heavens, sent there by slaves who have served the despotic ambitions of dangerous men. They may strike into the hearts of those of other lands and cause those of little faith to speak admiringly of Communist triumphs, but we Elks know better. We know that so long as Americans remain true to themselves, so long as we stand faithful to the concepts embodied in the Constitution of the United States and symbolized by that magnificent statue that stands in the harbor of this city, that America will always stand as a rock against which communism and every tyranny will break and perish.

As conservative as Elks are with respect to any attempts to tamper with our liberties, we are just as liberal when it comes to lending a helping hand to those who have suffered the hurts of life, to guide our youth toward the greatest fulfillment of their hopes and their demands. As a measure of this liberality, this generous spirit that animates the men of Elksdom, our Order last year spent more than \$7 million for benevolent programs, so many in number and so varied in character that they cannot be listed in detail, and the dollars invested in them are indeed a poor measure of their worth. A far better measure is the many thousands of crippled children whose bodies have been restored at our hospitals, the thousands of cerebral palsied youngsters who have been taught to talk and to dress and to feed themselves, and to have known the immeasurable thrill of joining other youngsters at school and at play, because the Elks provided the treatment which set them free.

When our colleges open their doors next September several hundred young Americans will be able to enter those doors only because the Elks dug into their pockets and gave them scholarships. Some of these young people are superior students, enormously gifted; others are just the average, but they all have talents that our country needs, and they will be able to make their greatest contribution to society because of the generosity of the Elks.

Always remember the men who defended our liberties and who today lie wounded or ill in hospitals. In gratitude for their sacrifices the Elks throughout the year and in every veterans' hospital in the land bring to these men entertainment and recreation. We remember them not only at Christmas but on other special occasions. The Elks National Service Commission under the guidance and leadership of my old and good friend, Judge Hallinan, presents programs of hope and encouragement in veterans' hospitals every week and every month of every year. In these and in other ways we try to bring cheer and pleasure and to share a little of the load they bear and, above all, to make them know that we do not and shall not forget.

These, my friends, are some of the true measures of Elksdom. They are, in fact, a reflection of the true greatness of America. They are the real spirit of America, the spirit that gives a meaning to the words of our Constitution. This is the spirit that flames from the torch high over New York Harbor, high across the world, and sends its messages of serene defiance to sputniks elsewhere.

Address of Welcome by the Honorable James A. Farley, Former Postmaster General of the United States, Past President of the New York State Elks Association, and Presently Chairman of the Board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the Opening of the Grand Lodge Convention of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, in the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, July 12, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I am particularly pleased, as a past exalted ruler of Brooklyn Lodge No. 22 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, to include with these remarks the address of welcome by the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, at the opening of the Grand Lodge Convention of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York on July 12, 1964:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Chairman Hall, Grand Exalted Ruler Dunn, past grand exalted rulers, Grand Chaplain Dr. Trout, officers and members of the Grand Lodge, Brother Elks and ladies, as many of you know, I have seldom missed an Elks national convention since my first convention in Atlantic City over 45 years ago. From time to time I have been honored by the privilege of addressing these gatherings of my brothers and my fellow Americans from

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3985

Government has practically no popular basis and suffers the onus of being the puppet of a foreign power. At worst, free elections would lead to a nationalist pro-Communist government.

As long as South Vietnam was prevented by the neutrality pact from joining any military bloc or being annexed by North Vietnam, however, it would still be a buffer state in the way of future Chinese expansion. And there is the possibility that with the return of a saner life in South Vietnam, viable political alternatives to the national liberation front would emerge.

This is not a sanguine picture. Surely we would prefer to leave South Vietnam with a democratic government committed to economic development and social progress. But there is no way of establishing such a government; surely our massive economic aid to a government by generals and our escalation of the war have not brought such a government closer.

The alternative in southeast Asia is not between flourishing democracy and communism but between trying neutralization and escalating a war in which no military victory seems possible; which devastates the countryside, makes American support of repugnant regimes seem necessary, and leaves China with the option to involve us in another Korean-type war.

Monocacy Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Battle of the Monocacy in Frederick County, Md., was not one of the larger battles of the Civil War in terms of troops involved, but it was a striking military operation costing the lives of some 2,000 men. Gen. Jubal Early's Confederate troops won a notable victory but the 24-hour delay gave the Union forces time to reinforce their defenses around the city of Washington. Had this battle of the Monocacy not occurred, the Confederate forces would, in all probability, have taken the Nation's Capital City.

Last November I introduced a bill to authorize the President to declare July 9 of this year as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of that battle. The bill was passed and the President signed the proclamation.

The city of Frederick held a 5-day celebration of this anniversary from July 5 through 9 with a program which included the reenactment of the ransom of Frederick and dedication of the first Maryland marker on the Monocacy battlefield. The Frederick County Civil War Centennial, Inc., The Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission, and the United Daughters of the Confederacy all cooperated in this successful celebration. The Honorable E. Paul Magaha, mayor of Frederick, and other city officials joined with Frederick citizens to present the reenactment. Speeches or messages were included from the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland;

the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey; the Honorable William W. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania; the Honorable Philip H. Hoff, Governor of Vermont.

The main address at the ransom of Frederick program on July 5 was delivered by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore and former Governor of Maryland. I include his inspirational remarks here for the attention of my colleagues.

REMARKS OF MAYOR THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BALTIMORE

For speed and daring Gen. Jubal Early may well be described as the George Patton of the Confederate Army, yet he gets singularly little attention in the history books. The reason is Monocacy. Generals Tyler and Wallace could not stop Early. But on this field they delayed him 2 days and those days were just enough to bring troops back from Virginia to stiffen the defenses of Washington. But for that delay Early might have come down in history as the never-to-be-forgotten Confederate commander who captured the National Capital.

But the Union paid a terrific price for the delay. Tyler lost 1,800 out of 6,000 men, a casualty rate of more than 25 percent, 2½ times the rate at which the Romans called a legion decimated. Monocacy was not as great a battle as Gettysburg, but few fields have been more hotly contested in all the history of warfare. However, it only measured up to the rest of that war. Only about 2 million men were engaged on both sides but the war cost 500,000 lives—probably more because the records, especially on the Confederate side, are not complete.

The explanation is that it was a family fight, traditionally the worst kind. When Americans fought Americans the fighting was more desperate and bloodier than when Americans have faced foes from any other nation. War is the world's great tragedy, but civil war is worse than any other kind, the greatest of all tragedies.

Standing on the field where the fierce struggle took place, it is fitting that we should reverently thank God that all this is a hundred years behind us. For a full century a reunited nation has lived in domestic peace, and in foreign war has been more solidly united than it ever was before Monocacy was fought. Yet even as we return thanks to a beneficent providence, we must not allow ourselves to forget the duty that lies upon us to make sure that conditions like those that produced the Civil War shall not be allowed to exist in this country.

The dragon's teeth that sprang up and flowered hideously from 1861 to 1865 were planted many years before Sumter was fired on. It may be asserted plausibly that the first handful were sown in 1619 when according to the colonial records, a Dutch ship sold to the planters of Jamestown 20 black slaves. With the cheap wisdom of hindsight, we can see now several occasions on which the fatal planting might have been plowed up. Jefferson, for example, wanted to write a repudiation of slavery in the Declaration of Independence. The foreign slave trade was condemned 11 years later in the Constitution, and many delegates wished to decree an end to the rest of the slave system. Several Presidents, the last being Abraham Lincoln, publicly favored emancipation by purchase.

But because each opportunity was allowed to slip, the evil at last had to be wiped out in blood and fire. "I tremble for my country," said Jefferson, "when I reflect that God is just." Each of us may well tremble when we reflect that in this case failure to do right when it was easy had to be paid for with the lives of hundreds of thousands of the bravest and best of both North and South.

Political commentators all assure us that a renewal of civil war in this country is inconceivable, and I thoroughly agree; but there are many evils short of war that are not inconceivable and that may be brought upon us by apathetic refusal to face new duties that new times lay upon us; and some of those evils are little short of the ultimate disaster of war.

It seems to me a plain lesson of history that the greatest villains are not necessarily the greatest dangers to this country. Benedict Arnold was exposed before he could do any serious damage. If Aaron Burr conspired at all, which many doubt, his conspiracy was nipped in the bud. Thieves have wormed their way into public office time and again, yet it is doubtful that all of them put together have stolen as much as the price of one giant aircraft carrier.

But honest men who refuse to face the facts, and dull men who cannot even see the facts, have brought upon us disasters many times worse than the damage that such a character as Boss Tweed inflicted on New York City. By 1861, the time had come when the institution of human slavery was no longer consonant with existence as a civilized nation, so for 4 years we reverted to the savagery of fratricidal strife. In the stress of emotion in those years and immediately after, the North said, and believed, that it was fighting against treason, the South said it was fighting against tyranny. Today we know that the basic cause of the conflict was neither treason nor tyranny. It was the reluctance of men, and especially of political leaders on both sides to face up to the facts, to admit that the poet was right when he said that "new occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth," and to act accordingly. But the result was a greater calamity than either treason or tyranny ever inflicted upon the Nation.

If we are honest with ourselves, can we say confidently that no such condition exists today? I am afraid not. It seems to me that there is all too much evidence that we are still afflicted by the reluctance that was the undoing of our ancestors. I still hear men prominent in public life arguing that the facts of the 20th century are not facts at all, that what was accepted as truth by our grandfathers must be accepted as truth by us, and that he who says otherwise is not an honest man but a secret enemy of the American way of life.

I am firmly persuaded that this state of mind is as dangerous today as it was in 1860. If you would know how dangerous it was then, look around you. Observe these monumental shafts, these sculptured figures, all attesting how on this spot thousands of brave men died to correct the errors of the statesmen in whom they had put their trust. I repeat, I do not fear another civil war, but I do fear to see a country riven by rancorous hatreds, not between North and South, but between class and class, race and race, sect and sect, haves and have-nots, rich and poor. A country so divided would be spiritually and intellectually paralyzed, made impotent to carry on the unfinished work that those whose blood once reddened this soil died to advance.

That work is a continuous process of improving, amending, and strengthening the processes of self-government by free men. Perhaps you noticed that I did not say democratic self-government. I omitted it because democracy is not an end, but only a means to an end. The end is equal justice under equal protection of laws that apply to all alike. It follows that to attain the end, governmental institutions must change as conditions change; and the political leader who resists every suggestion of change is resisting the law of life itself.

It is our great good fortune that it rests with us to carry on this work by peaceful means, by the ballot instead of the bullet,

A3986

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 29

by our labor instead of by the hazard of our lives. But because we are not called on to make the supreme sacrifice, we are all the more bound to make the lesser sacrifice of vigilance, of straight thinking, of honest voting.

We are not permitted to be at ease in Zion. We are not permitted to leave the decision on affairs of public interest to others, to the party, to the Governor, to the President. We shall not be held blameless if, refusing to think for ourselves, we follow blind leaders of the blind, for that means that both—not the blind leaders only, but both—shall fall into the ditch.

The inheritance that we have received from our fathers is great, indeed, but it is not a hoard to be spent idly, but an estate to be cared for and constantly improved. The men who fought here guarded that estate with their lives; we can guard it by nothing more exacting than diligence and honesty. But do not hug the false comfort that it no longer needs guarding. On the contrary, it has always been in danger and it is in danger now.

We have before our eyes shocking evidence that in parts of this country today, it is death to attempt to instruct an American citizen how to exercise his legal rights. It is death for a member of a minority group to try to organize his racial brethren to appeal for justice. It may be death for little children to go into the House of the Lord to pray to the God of our fathers.

All this happened far away from where we stand, but let us not lay the flattering unction to our souls that we have no responsibility in such matters. We have at least the responsibility to set our faces like flint against any political leader who suggests tolerance of such conditions, and who opposes the effort to eliminate them. Only by meeting that responsibility can we do our part toward achieving the ultimate purpose of this Union: "To secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Senator Dodd Was Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, William S. White, in his column, "The Passing Scene," in the Washington Evening Star of July 24, 1964, paid a deserved tribute to the acumen and farsightedness of the senior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD.

Senator Dodd has the capacity to take the long view, and his opinions have frequently been justified, in other instances, in the manner described by Mr. White.

I am happy to include Mr. White's column herewith for the information of Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE PASSING SCENE—SENATOR DODD WAS RIGHT

(By William S. White)

Communist-backed rebels are again—and still—at work in the Congo. And, by one of the supreme ironies of our time, the West's one best hope for their ultimate defeat lies in the very man the United Nations and the United States sought to crush in crushing the once independent Congolese Province of Katanga.

Katanga's old separateness from a then chaotic Central Congo Government—a separateness the United Nations was pleased to call "secession"—was destroyed at last by United Nations tanks and aircraft in what was meant to be a final and bloody defeat for Katanga's then premier, Moïse Tshombe.

But Mr. Tshombe, who was always visibly the best bet the West had in all the Congo, as its strongest anti-Communist, has now been called back to head the same Central Government which had, under the lash of the United Nations, striven so long for his liquidation even as a mere provincial leader.

It turned out that the Congo as a whole could not do without him. So now—suddenly, indeed—the archvillain of yesterday in the fervid rhetoric of United Nations propagandists—and of some of our State Department propagandists, too—has become the indispensable force if the Congo is to be saved from Communist penetration.

UNLIKE NKURUMAH

One no longer hears him described as "the tool of the Katanga mining interests" or as some sort of evil reactionary. Events—which is to say the slow march of commonsense—have rectified one of the most notable errors of the Kennedy administration. So, too, they have rehabilitated the reputation of the most sensible of current leaders in an Africa all too endowed with "leaders," such as the incredible Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, who are quite indistinguishable from the other tin-pot stooges of international communism all around the world.

Saying "I told you so" is an unpopular thing. But it is at times almost irresistible to those who in the past stood here in support of Tshombe in a small and lonely company amid the storms of shrill invective from ultraliberals who convinced themselves that the way to save the Congo was to smash the only man in it with the capacity to push for Western interests and ideals.

At the head of this small minority which has now become a majority—again, simply by the march of commonsense—was the man who took the worst beating of all, Senator Dodd, of Connecticut. Senator Dodd—an authentic liberal and indeed a man who on some domestic matters is uncomfortably liberal to this columnist at least—with infinite patience and fortitude fought month upon month. He fought most of all to make President Kennedy see that he was being led astray in his anti-Tshombe position by advisers whose patriotism is beyond question but whose judgment and realism have been condemned by history itself.

His reward was to be vilified as few politicians have been—though vilification never came from Mr. Kennedy, who himself was far from easy at the policy which had been thrust upon him. Senator Dodd found himself bracketed, in the hot, nonsensical sloganeering of our age, with "rightwingism," with "anticolonialism" and with God knows what else.

AN UNWELCOME HERO

He took his lumps. And he went on and on with what he believed to be, and what was, a high and desperately needed mission to help reclaim for the West what the West seemed hellbent to destroy in the Congo—that is, a Western position of strength.

He kept up communication with the Congo by going repeatedly to the Congo to see for himself. Patiently and repeatedly, he reported the facts to State Department people, most of whom were not willing then to listen and not happy to see the round, determined face of THOMAS J. DODD poking itself resolutely into offices which would gladly have barred him if they could.

It is past time now for a salute to this THOMAS J. DODD; and it is time, too, to draw a lesson or two from this episode.

The first lesson is that the U.S. Senate, where men of courage can take and hold un-

popular positions in the teeth of all the massive power of propaganda, is a pretty useful place, after all, in our national society.

The second lesson is that it is not the majority which is always right. The hopelessly minority opinion of today can still become the majority opinion of some tomorrow—always provided that the minority knows the facts and has the persistence to go on crying them out against all the forces of conformism.

Congress Better Act or Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1964

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial appeared in the Perry News Herald of Perry, Fla., which dealt with the Supreme Court's decision regarding the apportioning of State legislatures. I thought this was a most timely and thought-provoking editorial and agree entirely with the thoughts advanced therein. I am having it reprinted here so that other Members of Congress might have an opportunity to read it as I feel it is an excellent presentation of a most important subject:

CONGRESS BETTER ACT OR ELSE

"All powers not expressly delegated to Federal Government shall be reserved for the several States."

Read it again, two or three times, and let it sink in good. It's taken directly from the Constitution of these United States.

What happened to this portion of our Nation's Constitution when the U.S. Supreme Court declared recently that both houses in State legislatures—including Florida's—must be apportioned according to population?

And what happened to the sections in the Constitution that call for one House in the Federal Government to be apportioned by population, and the other to be apportioned by geography?

Since most State legislatures—also including Florida's legislature—are based on the Federal pattern, it would seem that the Supreme Court's next step, logically, is to declare apportionment of the Congress unconstitutional, and finally, declare the Constitution itself unconstitutional.

Thank goodness the Court has adjourned for the summer and will not meet again until October. Maybe this will give us time to let the awful truth sink in before the Court picks up its rod and staff and begins legislating again.

The Supreme Court, surely, has overstepped its authority with its far-reaching apportionment decision. The concept of the Court was not that it should crack the whip over the States, the Congress, the executive branch, and every other source of leadership in this Nation.

The Court was intended to serve as a valuable check and balance on a potentially headstrong Congress, to preserve the Constitution, constitutional law and its direction, and to make decisions based on justice and the Constitution. However, the Court has gone far afield in its decisionmaking and the results, we feel, do not reflect the conservative, sound reasoning based on law that is in keeping with the image of the Supreme Court.

In recent years, we have seen the Court accept suits against the established order of this Nation from persons varying from crack-